

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 4, 2006 has been carefully considered and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks herein.

Claims 1-234 and 236-319 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 317-319 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 72a, 72, 147, 150, 151 and 235 are objected to.

Claims 1-26, 44, 62, 64, 65, 72, 88-111, 129, 147-169, 172, 188, 205, 207, 208, 236-261, 264, 279, 298-300, 304, 306, 307, 309, 310, 312, 313, 315 and 316 have been amended.

Claims 46-61, 63, 72a, duplicate claim 72, 131-146, duplicate claims 150 and 151, 189-204, 235, 281-296 and 302 have been cancelled.

Claim Objection

Claims 72a, and duplicate claims 72, 150 and 151 stand objected-to as not conforming to the required method of numbering claims.

Claims 147 and 235 are objected-to for containing informalities.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his observation and has amended the claims to cancel claims 72a and duplicate claims 150 and 151 and renumber them as 317-319, respectively.

With regard to claim 147, appropriate correction to the identification of the element steps has been made. With regard to claim 235, this claim has been added and indicated to be cancelled.

For the amendments made to the claims, the reason for the objections has been overcome and applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 26, 30-32, 44, 62, 64, 88, 111, 147, 169, 205, 236 and 261 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. The Examiner states that the

terms “sufficient” and “generally” are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. With regard to claims 30-32 and 44 recite the element “said plurality of realms” lacks insufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of the claims. However, the claims have been amended to remove the objected-to terms and amended claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis for the element “said plurality of realm.”

For at least this reason, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13, 15-41, 44-55, 57-80, 82-100, 102-126, 129-140, 142-158, 160-184, 187-198, 200-216, 218-232, 235-248, 250-276, 279-290, 292-300, 302-307, 309, 310, 312, 313 and 315-319 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (USP no. 6,289, 382).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of the claims. However, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the associations represent at least one object common to at least two of said realms. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 16, lines 16-21.

Bowman-Amuah discloses a system, method and article of manufacture for delivering services via a globally addressable interface. A plurality of interfaces are provided with access allowed to a plurality of different sets of services from each of the interfaces. Each interface has a unique set of services associated therewith. Each of the interfaces is named with a name indicative of the unique set of services associated therewith. (see Abstract).

The Examiner has made reference to Bowman-Amuah reference to workflow between tasks (see col. 115, lines 27-48, col. 117, lines 1-22, col. 124, lines 5-21, etc.) as being comparable to the associations referred to in the claims. However, as the associations have been more clearly presented as representing at least one object common to at least two of said realms, applicant believes that the teachings of Bowman-Amuah fails to disclose such a feature in the workflows disclosed. Bowman-Amuah specifically teaches that “[w]orkflow enables tasks within a business process to be passed among the appropriate participants, in the correct

Applicant: Yemini, S.
U.S.S.N.: 10/813,842
Filing Date: March 31, 2004
EMC Docket No.: EMC-05-098(Pro)(Ord)

sequence and facilitates their completion within set times and budgets.” (see col. 115, lines 27-30). However, these workflows fail to represent at least one object common to at least two realms. Rather, the workflows “provide a means to define, monitor and control the sequence of work electronically.” (see col. 115, lines 49-52).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Bowman-Amuah cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Bowman-Amuah fails to disclose each and every element recited.

Applicant believes the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

With regard to the remaining independent claims, the remarks made in response to the rejection of claim 1 are applicable in response to the rejection of the remaining independent claims. For the amendments made to the remaining independent claims, which are similar to those made to claim 1, and for the remarks made in response to the rejection of claim 1, which are reasserted, as if in full, in response to the rejection of the remaining independent claims, it is submitted that the reason for the rejection of these claims has been overcome. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

With regard to the remaining dependent claims, these claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to be allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, the remaining claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 14, 56, 81, 101, 141, 159, 199, 217, 249 and 291 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah and further in view of Semeria (Multiprotocol Label Switching: Enhancing Routing in the New Public Network). This instant Office Action states that Bowman-Amuah fails to teach or suggest Multi-Protocol Label Switching Virtual Private Network

The aforementioned claims dependent from the independent claims, which have been shown to include subject matter not disclosed by Bowman-Amuah. Semeria fails to provide any

Applicant: Yemini, S.
U.S.S.N.: 10/813,842
Filing Date: March 31, 2004
EMC Docket No.: EMC-05-098(Pro)(Ord)

teaching to correct the deficiency in subject matter found to exist in Bowman-Amuah. Thus, the combination of Bowman-Amuah and Semeria fails to disclose all the elements recited in the independent claims and, consequently, the dependent claims.

Accordingly, the aforementioned claims are not rendered obvious by the references cited as the combination of the references fails to disclose all of the elements claimed.

For at least this reason, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 42, 43, 127, 128, 185, 186, 233, 234, 277, 278, 301, 308, 311 and 314 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah and further in view of McGee (USPPA no. 2003/0079160). The instant Office Action states that Bowman-Amuah fails to teach root cause analysis of events in said system of events in said system and correlation of events of said system. McGee teaches root cause analysis and correlation of events in paragraph [0054] and [0058].

The aforementioned claims depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to include subject matter not disclosed by Bowman-Amuah. McGee fails to provide any teaching to correct the deficiency in subject matter found to exist in Bowman-Amuah. Thus, the combination of Bowman-Amuah and McGee fails to disclose all the elements recited in the independent claims and, consequently, the dependent claims.

Accordingly, the aforementioned claims are not rendered obvious by the references cited as the combination of the references fails to disclose all of the elements claimed.

For at least this reason, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Applicant further respectfully requests a change of the "Attorney Docket Number" from "EMC-SMARTS" to "EMC-05-098(Pro)(Ord)" to correspond with Attorney's internal reference number for the instant application.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (914) 798 8505.

Applicant: Yemini, S.
U.S.S.N.: 10/813,842
Filing Date: March 31, 2004
EMC Docket No.: EMC-05-098(Pro)(Ord)

A petition for a two month extension of time for filing this response to the instant Office Action is filed herewith. Please charge all fees occasioned by this submission to Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

4/12/07



Carl A. Giordano, Esq. (Reg. No. 41,780)
Attorney for Applicants
EMC Corporation
Office of General Counsel
44 S. Broadway, 7th flr.
White Plains, NY 10601
Telephone: (914) 798 8505

Kindly return all written communications to:

EMC Corporation
Office of General Counsel
176 South Street
Hopkinton, MA 01748